

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/553,164	07/05/2006	Thian Hoey Tio	TS1519 US 9075		
23632 SHELL OIL C	7590 12/12/200 OMPANY	EXAMINER			
P O BOX 2463			HANDAL, KAITY V		
HOUSTON, TX 772522463			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1795		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/12/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/553,164	TIO, THIAN HOEY
Examiner	Art Unit
Kaity Handal	1795

	Kaity Handal	1795	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 20 November 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the contract of the	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount thortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered b	ecause
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further cot (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belot (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially re	TE below); ducing or simplifying	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		II be entered and an e	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 			nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>२∫४∫∂</u> 00	07	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding applicant's arguments that there is no teaching or suggestion in Fuderer of having a steam to carbon ratio below 1. Therefore, it is only by hindsight that one of skill in the art having the teachings of Fuderer before him would be able to arrive at the present invention. Examiner respectfully disagrees. While Fuderer discloses that the steam to carbon molar ratio of feed to step (b) is controlled (C6/L2-7), with the desire to minimize said ratio (C3/L38-42 and C4/L42-43) the reference does not explicitly disclose said ratio being below 1, and further between 0.5 and 0.9. The specific steam to carbon molar ratio of feed to step (b) is not considered to confer patentability to the claims. As the reactor operating efficiency and product composition are variables that can be modified, among others, by adjusting said steam to carbon molar ratio of feed to step (b) would have been considered a result effective variable by one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. As such, without showing unexpected results, the claimed steam to carbon molar ratio of feed to step (b) cannot be considered critical. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have optimized, by routine experimentation, the steam to carbon molar ratio of feed to step (b) in the process of Fuderer to obtain the desired balance between the operation efficiency and product composition (In re Boesch, 617 F.2d. 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980)), since it has been held that where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. (In re Aller, 105 USPQ 223).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaity Handal whose telephone number is (571) 272-8520. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KH) 12/3/2007

ALEXA D. NECKEL SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINED